

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 stand rejected. Claims 1-30 remain pending in this patent application. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the remarks set forth below. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments herein to this patent application do not add new matter to it.

35 U.S.C. §101 Rejection

The present Office Action alleges that "Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter." Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-20 as herein amended render this rejection moot.

Double Patenting Objection

The present Office Action alleges that "Claims 12-16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 1-5, 11, 7, 9 and 10 respectively." Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12-16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 as herein amended render this rejection moot.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

The present Office Action alleges that "Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention."

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-20 as herein amended render this rejection moot.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-30 of the present application are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hall et al., US Patent Number 5,898,831 (hereinafter Hall).

CLAIM 1

Applicants respectfully contend that Hall fails to teach or suggest subject matter recited in newly amended independent Claim 1. For instance, amended Claim 1 recites in part (emphasis added):

a portable computing device comprising a radio frequency identification integrated circuit that outputs a radio frequency signal containing a security code in response to being located within a radio frequency signal field, said radio frequency identification integrated circuit is inactive except when located within said radio frequency signal field;

Applicants respectfully assert that Hall does not teach or suggest the combined functionality of the radio frequency identification integrated circuit as recited in amended Claim 1. Since Hall fails to teach or suggest at least one element specifically recited in amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully contend that Hall cannot anticipate nor render obvious amended Claim 1.

Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended independent Claim 1 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Hall. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit amended Claim 1 is allowable over Hall.

CLAIM 12

Applicants respectfully assert that Hall fails to teach or suggest subject matter recited in newly amended independent Claim 12. For instance, amended Claim 12 recites in part (emphasis added):

a docking station;

a portable computer system that outputs a signal containing a password once coupled to said docking station, wherein said docking station receives and outputs said signal;

Applicants respectfully contend that Hall does not teach or suggest a docking system and portable computer system that operate as recited in amended Claim 12. Since Hall fails to teach or suggest at least one element specifically recited in amended Claim 12, Applicants respectfully assert that Hall cannot anticipate nor render obvious amended Claim 12.

Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended independent Claim 12 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Hall. As such, Applicants respectfully submit amended Claim 12 is allowable over Hall.

CLAIM 21

Applicants respectfully contend that Hall fails to teach or suggest subject matter recited in newly amended independent Claim 21. For instance, amended Claim 21 recites in part (emphasis added):

transmitting said security code when said radio frequency identification integrated circuit is energized by a radio frequency signal field;

Applicants respectfully assert that Hall does not teach or suggest transmitting a security code when a radio frequency identification integrated circuit is energized by a radio frequency signal field as recited in amended Claim 21. Since Hall fails to teach or suggest at least one element specifically recited in amended Claim 21, Applicants respectfully contend that Hall cannot anticipate nor render obvious newly amended Claim 21.

Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended independent Claim 21 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Hall. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit amended Claim 21 is allowable over Hall.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of rejected Claims 1-30.

Based on the reasoning presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that amended Claims 1-30 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: MARCH 23, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thomas M. Catale', written over a horizontal line.

Thomas M. Catale
Registration No.: 46,434

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

Phone: (408) 938-9060
Facsimile: (408) 938-9069